

REMARKS

In the **final** Office Action mailed December 14, 2009 the Office noted that claims 1-3 and 5-20 were pending and rejected claims 1-3 and 5-20. In this amendment claims 1, 3, 7-9, 12, 15, 16, 19 and 20 have been amended, no claim has been cancelled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-3 and 5-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 9-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0129249 in view of Menezes, *Handbook on Applied Cryptography*. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, for example, "constructing a single identifier for **the plurality of** computer software programs to be transmitted during step c) based on information relating to each of the **computer** software programs of the **plurality of computer software programs** and in that the at least one encryption/decryption module carries out the same operation as that carried out during step e) in order to reconstruct a unique identifier corresponding to that constructed during step e) **upon** the **plurality of computer software programs** received by the decoder **being** identical to that transmitted by

the transmitter." Support for the amendment may be found, for example, on page 13, line 1 of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of the claims.

Amended claim 1 is not obvious, since neither Booth nor Menezes discloses using a Single Identifier for a plurality of software programs. Moreover, neither Booth nor Menezes discloses an identifier constructed from information relating to each of the computer software programs of a plurality of software programs.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard and Menezes, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 12 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 5 and 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard in view of Menezes in view of Booth, WO 01/61437. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Booth adds nothing to the deficiencies of Maillard and Menezes as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard, Menezes and Booth taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 5 and 9.

Claims 14 and 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard in view of Menezes in

view of Booth in further view of Gammie, U.S. Patent No. 5,029,207. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Gammie adds nothing to the deficiencies of Maillard, Menezes and Booth as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard, Menezes, Booth and Gammie taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 14 and 18.

Claims 6-8 and 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Maillard in view of Menezes in further view of Nagae, U.S. Patent No. 5,598,530. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claim 7 has been amended to include the features of independent claims 1 and intervening claims 3 and 6. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of claim 7. The prior art of record fails to disclose using a second identifier for each software program of the plurality, transmitted together with each corresponding computer software program, wherein the reconstruction of the first identifier is authorized only when the second identifier is verified.

Nagae adds nothing to the deficiencies of Maillard and Menezes as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Maillard, Menezes and

Nagae taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 6-8 and 20.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-3 and 5-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg. No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jaa